Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice - 12 (2) (Supplementary Special Issue) • Spring • 1359-1366

www.edam.com.tr/estp

A Normative Investigation of Faculty Perceptions of Undergraduate Teaching*

Ahmet AYPAY[a]
Eskişehir Osmangazi University

Osman ÇEKİÇ
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

Munise SEÇKİN
Eskişehir Osmangazi University

Abstract

This study aims to investigate faculty perspectives on undergraduate teaching practices from a normative perspective. Maximum variation for purposeful sampling technique was employed to define the sample for the study. The diversity in the institutions where the faculty members were employed and academic rank was considered during sample selection. The sample of the study consisted of 282 faculty members who worked at seventeen different public universities during 2011-2012 academic-year. College Teaching Behaviors Inventory was used to collect the data. The Inventory was comprised of 8 categories which included 126 items related to teaching behaviors. The data gathered from the faculty members were analyzed with the use of simple descriptive statistics like, frequencies, percentages, and means. Furthermore, t-tests, ANOVA, and multivariate analysis techniques like factor analysis, MANOVA, and discriminant analysis were also employed to analyze the analyses. The results of the study revealed 5 categories and 50 behaviors that can be classified as inviolable norms, while there were 10 categories and 64 behaviors that were classified as admonitory norms. Significant differences were found between inviolable norms and institutions, disciplines, and faculty rank. Significant differences were found between factors scores related to admonitory norms and various higher education institutions and academic disciplines. The results of the study are used to provide recommendations that will aid in the identification and description of normative structure of colleges and universities.

Key Words

Values, Values Education, Norms of Science, Faculty Members, Universities.

Communities use education to transfer their beliefs, thoughts, values and other behavioral expectations to new generations. Communities also hold education responsible, in addition to knowledge transfer and skills training, to generate values that help in their sustainability and development, to protect existing values, and to be a bridge between the old and the new values (Varış, 1998, p. 1).

Values are also present in teaching. Through teaching, individuals develop affective properties that include emotional characteristics and tendencies and psychomotor properties that include mind-muscle coordination along with learning concepts, recalling principles, comprehension, and development of cognitive abilities (Senemoğlu, 2010). These various abilities that are distinct from each other have been grouped under three behavioral areas: psychomotor, affective and cognitive. Affective dimension, which is composed of feelings, beliefs, attitudes and values, has a positive effect on individuals' performances (Tarhan, 2012).

Theoretical perspectives on values can be based on the ancient Greeks and Socrates in particular. Two central elements in Socrates' philosophy were morality and logic. From a Socratic perspective, values teaching may involve such strategies as values clarification, critical thinking exercises and conversa-

* An earlier version of this study was presented at the Values Education Symposium, October 26–28, 2011, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir, Turkey.

a **Ahmet AYPAY, Ph.D.**, is a professor in educational administration. He focuses on the connections among educational administration, policy analysis and organizational studies. Corrspondence: Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Meşelik Kampüsü 26480 Eskişehir/Turkey. E-mail: aypaya@yahoo.com phone: +90 222 239 3750 Fax: +90 222 229 3124.

tion. Aristotle was more concerned with moral virtues. These virtues included friendliness, honesty, justice and courage (Ling & Stephenson, 1998, p. 5).

The word value, introduced to social sciences by Znanieck for the first time, is derived from the word "valere" which means "to be valuable" or "to be strong" in Latin (Bilgin, 1995, p. 83). Since the ancient times, the relationship between social life and various values have attracted the attention of many thinkers like Aguste Comte, De Roberty, Durkheim, Plato, Aristotle, and Karl Marx.

Values have been the subject of many disciplines like sociology, philosophy, anthropology, and psychology. And in recent years it has been the subject of education. As a result, many definitions have emerged. Values as are our standards and principles for judging worth. They are the criteria by which we judge 'things' (people, objects, ideas, actions, and situations) to be good, worthwhile, desirable, or, on the other hand bad worthless, despicable (Shaver & Strong, 1976, p.15 as cited in Halstead, 1996, p. 6).

First significant study on values was done by F. C. Sharp in 1928 (Aydın, 2003, p. 126). Since then, many studies had focused on values (Rokeach, 1968, 1973; Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990). As a result of these studies many classifications have emerged. Rokeach (1973) looked at values in terms of beliefs, preferences, and standards. Schwartz and colleagues have defined types of values in their studies (Schwartz; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990; Schwartz, Caprara, & Vecchione, 2010, p. 424).

Values are versatile standards that guide and determine actions, attitudes towards objects and situations, ideology, presentation of the self, judgments, decisions, to show cause, to compare him/her with others, and to attempt to influence others (İşcan, 2007, p. 32). In recent years, social sciences fields started to use more objective criteria rather than subjective approaches while studying values (Özensel, 2003, p. 236).

In his classical work on behaviors of scientists, Merton (1973, p. 225) has formulated four norms underlying science ethics. These four norms of science as follows: *communality*, *disinterestedness, skepticism*, and *universalism*. According to Merton (1968, 1973) norms are prescribed and proscribed patterns of behavior (Braxton & Bayer, 1999, p. 2). Behavioral patterns include beliefs, meanings, values and attitudes in a culture (Fichter, 1994, p. 84). However, norms represent the "collective conscience" of a social group (Durkheim, 1982 as cited in Braxton & Bayer, 1999, p.3). Norms are rules that force group members to behave in a certain way when they face various events (Aslantürk & Amman, 2000, p. 268). Norms are based on value judgments. Values and norms are generally learned during the socialization process and become habits for individuals (Canatan, 2004, p. 45). In sociology, values and norms can be seen as social control mechanisms which could be used as a system that regulates human relations.

Values education means the teaching of social, political, cultural and aesthetic values (Veugelers & Vedder, 2003 as cited in Balcı & Yelken, 2010, p. 82). Values education has become an important subject in a developing and changing world. The main responsibility of the family, society, and school is raising individuals who have embraced the basic human values. Thus, it is possible to argue that one of the main goals of the school is to raise academically successful individuals, and the other is produce individuals who have embraced basic values of humanity (Ekşi, 2003). Values education is a process that starts in the family but is mostly shaped by the environment and educational institutions. Transfer of values continues in schools in a formal structure. Values education also helps individuals to construct their self worth and respect common values like honesty, truth, and justice. Ability to develop sense of social responsibility and evaluate ones decisions and actions are also results of values education (Stephenson, Ling, Burman, & Cooper, 1998, p. 162).

Despite the importance of norms as components of social structure of science, Merton has claimed that behaviors of scientists had been deviated from these norms. However, these norms are, still, perceptions on the behaviors of academic researchers (Anderson & Louis, 1994, p. 275).

The universities, as the main source of knowledge production, has a variety of duties, authorities, and responsibilities like conducting scientific research, knowledge and technology generation, dissemination of scientific knowledge, and contribution to national and universal development (Karaman & Bakırcı, 2010, s. 95). Values play an important role in higher education institutions as it does at any level of educational process.

Academic, humanistic and ethical values are very important and have to be present in organizational cultures of higher education institutions (Erdem, 2003, p. 59). The identification and definition of norms and perceptions of faculty is important in defining the control mechanisms in higher edu-

cation institutions. This study aims to investigate faculty perceptions on undergraduate teaching practices from a normative perspective. With this broader purpose, this study explores answers to following questions:

- What are the inviolable norms related to teaching in undergraduate education?
- What are the admonitory norms related to teaching in undergraduate education?
- Do inviolable norms show differences by institutions?
- Do admonitory norms show differences by institutions?
- Do inviolable norms show differences by faculty rank?
- Do inviolable norms show differences by various academic disciplines?
- Is there a significant difference between the factor scores of faculty members' opinions regarding admonitory behaviors on institutions and academic disciplines?

Method

Model

Survey methods were used in this study. Surveys can be used to collect data on a group of individual about their beliefs, perceptions, features, and past or present behaviors (Neuman, 2010, p. 395).

Participants

Maximum variation for purposeful sampling technique was employed to define the sample for the study. The diversity in the institutions where the faculty members were employed and academic rank was considered during sample selection. The sample included a total of 282 faculty members who had worked at 17 different public higher education institutions in Turkey during 2011-2012 education year. These universities were: Dumlupinar, Hacettepe, Afyon Kocatepe, Atatürk, Mersin, Akdeniz, Antalya, Sakarya, Eskisehir Osmangazi, Anadolu, Canakkale, Zonguldak Karaelmas, Aksaray, Cankırı Karatekin, Kastamonu, Pamukkale, and Sinop.

Instruments

The data were gathered via "College Teaching Behaviors Inventory" developed by Braxton and Bayer (1999). The instrument was comprised of 126 items related to teaching behaviors these behaviors were grouped under 8 categories. These categories were: Planning for the Course (14 behaviors), First Day of Class (14 behaviors), in-Class Behaviors (21 behaviors), Handling Course Content (9 behaviors), Examination and Grading Practices (25 behaviors), Faculty-Student In-Class Interaction (9 behaviors), Relationship with Colleagues (16 behaviors), and Out-of-Class Practices (18 behaviors). The items in the instrument were worded negatively to better define the faculty members' behaviors related to teaching. This method was suggested by Durkheim (1934), as a general principle which argues that individuals recognize norms better when they are violated (Braxton, Bayer, & Finkelstein, 1992).

Faculty members were asked to provide their opinions on each specific behavior and were asked to describe ideal situations where there would be 40 enrolled students in a course weather they actually teach it or not. The inventory included five response categories: Appropriate (1), discretionary (2), mildly inappropriate (3), Not Appropriate (4), Inappropriate (5) for statistical reasons. The answers for each of the 126 behavioral items were given numerical values from 1 to 5. According to these values, only behaviors with a mean value of 4 and higher were classified as inviolable norms. Behaviors for which the mean value was between 3.00 and 3.99 were classified as admonitory norms. The reason for this classification was derived from the fact that for statistical reasons 4 and 5 in the Likert scale were used as "not appropriate" and "inappropriate" behaviors. Thus, because the survey instrument included negative statements, values 4 and over were classified as inviolable norms. Such a classification is also accepted by the American Social Psychology Association (Braxton & Bayer, 1999).

Before the factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Barlett Sphericity tests were conducted to determine the appropriateness of data that belongs to inviolable and admonitory norms. The KMO values were found to be 0.97 and 0.93 for each type of norms respectively. The KMO results showed that the data were appropriate to run factor analysis (Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, & Barrett, 2011). Additionally, Barlett Sphericity Test was conducted, to determine if they are from multivariate normal distribution and the results were found to be 13776.465 and 11392.280 (p<0.000) respectively. The KMO and Barlett's Tests showed that the data were appropriate to be used in factor analysis.

Procedures

Faculty members who teach an undergraduate course with an average number of at least 40 students were invited to complete the survey. The data were collected by the researchers. Faculty members were provided with enough time to complete the survey.

Simple descriptive means were used to determine those behavioral patterns that are classified as admonitory norms or inviolable norms. One way ANOVA for independent samples was used to compare inviolable norms by institutions, faculty rank, and disciplines. One way ANOVA for independent samples was used to compare admonitory norms by institutions while one way MANOVA was used to compare admonitory norms by academic disciplines.

Results

The mean of 50 behavioral patterns in the inventory were found to be 4.0 and above. These behaviors were delineated as inviolable norms. Among the eight categories in the inventory a total of 50 behaviors were classified as inviolable norms. Two behavioral items were classified as inviolable norms for Planning for the Course, 7 for First Day of Class, 10 for In-Class Behaviors, 4 for Handling Course Content, 6 for Examination and Grading Practices, 6 for Faculty-Student In-Class Interaction, 11 Relationship with Colleagues, and 4 for Out-of-Class Practices.

The mean of 64 inventory items were found to be between 4.00 and 3.80. These behaviors were classified as admonitory behaviors. The distribution of 64 items among the 8 categories in the inventory were as follows: eleven behavioral patterns were classified as admonitory norm for Planning for the Course, 7 for First Day of Class, 11 for in-Class Behaviors, 5 for Handling Course Content, 11 for Examination and Grading Practices, 3 for Faculty-Student In-Class Interaction, 12 for Out-of-Class Practices, and 4 Relationship with Colleagues.

One way ANOVA for independent samples was used to examine the variation in inviolable norms by institutions. Statistically significant variations were observed between institutions and three sub-dimensions of inviolable norms (moral turpitude, not announcing the topics or objectives of the class, not behaving objectively) [$F_{(3\text{-}272)}$=4,958, p<.025; $F_{(3\text{-}269)}$=3,431, p<.025; $F_{(3\text{-}268)}$=4,040, p<.025]. To identify the variation between sub-dimensions, LSD tests were conducted. The results revealed significant variation between institutions that were established before 1980 and institutions established between 1981 and 1990, in terms of not announcing the topics or objectives of the class. Furthermore, there found to be significant differences between institutions founded between 1981 and 1990 and institutions founded between 1991 and 2000. In terms of moral turpitude sub-dimension, significant differences were observed between institutions established between 1981 and 1990 and institutions established before 1980 and those established between 1991 and 2000. In terms of not behaving objectively sub-dimension, significant variations were observed between institutions established before 1980 and those established between 1981- and 2000 and after 2000. Additionally, significant differences were observed between institutions established between 1991-2000, between 1981 and 1990, and after 2000 (p<.025). Furthermore, the homogeneity of variances was tested.

One way ANOVA was conducted to examine admonitory norms and variation by institutions. The results revealed significant variation between various institutions and five sub-dimensions of admonitory norms (failure to comply with the lesson plan, disregard for teaching methods or procedures, failure to use course time effectively, disregard for instructional methods and techniques, and disregard for students) [$F_{(3\text{-}269)}$=7,925, p<.025; $F_{(3\text{-}268)}$=3,224, p<.025; $F_{(3\text{-}268)}$=3,244, p<.025; $F_{(3\text{-}270)}$=5,189, p<.025; $F_{(3\text{-}271)}$=7,317, p<.025]. LSD tests were conducted to identify the variation between sub-dimensions. The LSD tests revealed significant differences between institutions established between 1981 and 1990 and those established before 1980, between 1991 and 2000, and after 2000 in terms of failure to comply with the lesson plan sub-dimension. Significant differences between institutions established between 1981 and 1990 and those established between 1991 and 2000 were observed in terms of disregard for teaching methods and or procedures sub-dimension. Additionally, for failure to use course time effectively sub-dimension, significant differences were observed between institutions established after 2000 and those established before 1980 and between 1991 and 2000. Furthermore, significant differences were observed between institutions established 1981 and 1990 and those established before 1980 and between 1991 and 2000 in terms of disregard for instructional methods and techniques sub-dimension. Finally, significant differences were observed between institutions established between 1991 and 2000 and those established before 1980 and between 1981 and 1990 in terms of disregard for instructional methods and techniques sub-dimension. There were also significant differences

between institutions established between 1981 and 1990 and those established after 2000 in terms of disregard for instructional methods and techniques (p<.025). Furthermore, the homogeneity of variances was tested.

Variation in admonitory norms by academic ranks was explored via one way ANOVA. The results revealed significant variation between academic rank and one sub-dimension of admonitory behaviors (failure to establish course standards) [$F_{(3-269)}$=3,568, p<.025]. Furthermore, the homogeneity of variances was tested. Additionally, to determine the variation between academic ranks, LSD tests were conducted. The results revealed significant differences between research assistants and lecturers and faculty with ranks of associate professor and above in terms of failure to establish course standards sub-dimension (p<.025).

One-way ANOVA procedure was used to explore the variation between academic disciplines in terms of admonitory norms. The results revealed significant differences between five sub-dimensions of admonitory norms and academic disciplines (failure to announce the topics or objectives of the class, failure to establish course standards, moral turpitude, not behaving objectively, and inability to communicate). [$F_{(3-262)}$=8,059, p<.025; $F_{(3-259)}$=11,266, p<.025; $F_{(3-259)}$=12,822, p<.025; $F_{(3-258)}$=14,597, p<.025; $F_{(3-261)}$=9,356, p<.025]. Furthermore, the homogeneity of variances was tested and LSD tests were conducted to determine the variation between academic disciplines. The results of the LSD tests revealed significant differences between engineering disciplines and basic, health, and educational sciences in five sub-dimensions of admonitory behaviors (p<.025).

One factor MANOVA was conducted to explore if a significant variation exists in the factor scores of faculty perceptions on admonitory norms by academic disciplines. The scores that belong to "failure to comply with lesson plan" and "draw reaction from colleagues" were not included in the analysis to meet the assumption of homogeneity of variances.

The MANOVA for "disregard for learning processes", "not sharing information with colleagues", "disregard for students" scores of faculty perceptions on admonitory norms indicated significant differences in the factor scores by academic disciplines, Wilks Lambda (Λ)=0,832, $F_{(10, 241)}$=4,87, p<.01. This finding shows that the scores of the linear component derived from "disregard for learning processes", "not sharing information with colleagues", and "disregard for students" differ significantly from "not being helpful help", "not use class time efficiently", "disregard for the use teaching methods", "not lecture the first day of classes", and "not taking attendance" by academic disciplines.

According to Field (2009), when the results of MANOVA are significant, it is possible to conduct one factor ANOVA or discriminant analysis. Discriminant analysis allows the researcher to examine the differences between two or more groups using a set of variables (Silva & Stam, 1998, p. 277). The second option was explored in this study this is because the nature of the relationships between dependent variables is important. The discriminant analysis is how well inferential variables (admonitory norms) predict group membership of cases is the *classification matrix (*faculty perceptions by academic disciplines*).* The test revealed a significant Wilk's Lambda (Lambda (Λ)=0,82, $X^2(15, N=251)=50,14, p$<.001). Thus, the results show that admonitory norms as inferential variables to predict grouping of faculty perceptions by academic disciplines.

Relatively highest positive relationship exists with factor score of "failure to comply lesson plan", followed by the factor scores of "not being helpful", "disregard learning processes", "draw reaction of colleagues" and "not to follow the lesson plan" in the order given.

The analysis of the mean, standard deviation, and factor-based one way ANOVA results of eight factors of the inventory revealed significant differences in the factor scores of "disregard for learning processes", "not sharing information with colleagues", and "disregard for students" of faculty perceptions on admonitory norms by academic disciplines $F_{(1-250)}$=9,86, p<.05; $F_{(1-250)}$=4,31, p<.05; $F_{(1-250)}$=8,02, p<.05. However, no significant differences were found in the factor scores of "not being helpful", "not using class time effectively", "disregard for the use of teaching methods"," not to lecture the first day of classes", and "not taking attendance", $F_{(1-250)}$=0,00, p>.05; $F_{(1-250)}$=0,92, p>.05; $F_{(1-250)}$=1,87, p>.05; $F_{(1-250)}$=0,72, p>.05; $F_{(1-250)}$=0,00, p>.05. Additionally, the factor scores "disregard for learning processes", "not using class time effectively", "disregard for the use of teaching methods", and "disregard for students" for faculty in educational sciences found to be higher than those in basic sciences for admonitory norms.

Discussion

This study aims to investigate faculty perceptions on undergraduate teaching practices from a normative perspective. First "College Teaching Behaviors

Inventory" developed by Braxton and Bayer (1999) was adapted and translated to Turkish by four experts. After the initial translations by each expert, these translations were compared and statements that differed between experts were identified. After a discussion on these differing items, statements were rewritten with the agreement of the experts and then included in the inventory.

The answers provided by the faculty members were scored from 1 to 5 for the 126 items in the inventory. According to this scoring scheme, items with a mean of 4 and higher were classified as inviolable norms, while items with a mean of between 3 and 3.99 were classified as admonitory norms.

Fifty items discerned as inviolable norms were included in the factor analysis and found to be grouped under five factors. The variance explained by these five factors was .70 % and was acceptable. The common variances explained by these five factors changed between 0.44 and 0.72. After the examination of the items in each factor, the five identified factors were named as: "failure to announce the topics or objectives of the class", "failure to establish course standards", "moral turpitude", "not behaving objectively", and "inability to communicate". The Cronbach alpha estimates of internal consistency reliability were computed for each of these factors. The Cronbach alpha values for these sub-dimensions of the inventory ranged between 0.92 and 0.96.

The factor analysis of sixty four items discerned as admonitory norms resulted in 10 factors. These 10 factors were found to explain 63 percent of the variance in the inventory. The common variance explained by the 10 factor has ranged between 0.41 and 0.88.

After reviewing the structure of the items in each of the factors, the ten factors were named as: "failure to comply with the lesson plan", "disregard for learning processes", "not being helpful", "failure to use course time effectively", "draw criticism from colleagues", "disregard for instructional methods and techniques", "not sharing information with colleagues", "not teaching the first day", "not taking attendance", and "disregard for students". The Cronbach alpha estimates of internal consistency reliability were computed for each of these factors. Cronbach alpha values for these sub-dimensions of the inventory ranged between 0.67 and 0.92.

Braxton et al. (1992) had found 25 behaviors that were discerned as inviolable norms and four normative patterns (factors). These were interpersonal disregard, particularistic grading, moral turpitude, and inadequate planning (p. 547). However, a later study by Braxton and Bayer (1999) had identified 33 items that can be discerned as inviolable norms and five normative patterns (factors). In addition, Braxton and Bayer had discerned 53 items as admonitory behaviors and identified nine patters. In this study 50 items were discerned as inviolable norms and five normative patterns were identified for these items. As opposed to Braxton and Bayer's findings, 64 items were discerned as admonitory norms and 10 patterns were identified. This difference might be caused by the application of the inventory in two different cultures.

Statistically significant variations were observed between institutions and three sub- dimensions of inviolable norms (moral turpitude, not announcing the topics or objectives of the class, not behaving objectively). To identify the variation between subdimensions, LSD tests were conducted. The results revealed significant variation between institutions that were established before 1980 and institutions established between 1981 and 1990, in terms of not announcing the topics or objectives of the class. Furthermore, there found to be significant differences between institutions founded between 1981 and 1990 and institutions founded between 1991 and 2000. In terms of moral turpitude subdimension, significant differences were observed between institutions established between 1981 and 1990 and institutions established before 1980 and those established between 1991 and 2000. In terms of not behaving objectively sub-dimension, significant variations were observed between institutions established before 1980 and those established between 1981- and 2000 and after 2000. Additionally, significant differences were observed between institutions established between 1991-2000, between 1981 and 1990, and after 2000. According to these results, it is possible to argue that there might be differences of opinion between faculty members who are employed at institutions founded between 1981 and 1990 and those established before 1980 and between 1991 and 2000 in terms of moral turpitude, not announcing the topics or objectives of the class, not behaving objectively.

There found to be significant variations between various institutions and five sub-dimensions of admonitory norms (failure to comply with the lesson plan, disregard for teaching methods or procedures, failure to use course time effectively, disregard for instructional methods and techniques, and disregard for students). The LSD tests revealed significant differences between institutions established

between 1981 and 1990 and those established before 1980, between 1991 and 2000, and after 2000 in terms of failure to comply with the lesson plan sub-dimension. Significant differences between institutions established between 1981 and 1990 and those established between 1991 and 2000 were observed in terms of disregard for teaching methods and or procedures sub-dimension. Additionally, for failure to use course time effectively sub-dimension, significant differences were observed between institutions established after 2000 and those established before 1980 and between 1991 and 2000. Furthermore, significant differences were observed between institutions established 1981 and 1990 and those established before 1980 and between 1991 and 2000 in terms of disregard for instructional methods and techniques sub-dimension. Finally, significant differences were observed between institutions established between 1991 and 2000 and those established before 1980 and between 1981 and 1990 in terms of disregard for instructional methods and techniques sub-dimension. There were also significant differences between institutions established between 1981 and 1990 and those established after 2000 in terms of disregard for instructional methods and techniques. Based on these results, it is possible to infer that there might be differences of opinion between faculty members who are employed at institutions founded before 1980 and those established between 1981 and 1990, between 1991 and 2000, and after 2000 in terms of failure to comply with the lesson plan, disregard for teaching methods or procedures, failure to use course time effectively, disregard for instructional methods and techniques, and disregard for students.

The results also revealed significant variation between academic rank and one sub-dimension of admonitory behaviors (failure to establish course standards). The results of the LSD tests revealed significant differences between research assistants and lecturers and faculty with ranks of associate professor and above in terms of failure to establish course standards sub-dimension. From these results it is possible to infer that there might be differences of opinion between research assistants and faculty with a rank of associate professor and above and lecturers in terms of establishing course standards.

The results revealed significant differences between five sub-dimensions of admonitory norms and academic disciplines (failure to announce the topics or objectives of the class, failure to establish course standards, moral turpitude, not behaving objectively, and inability to communicate. The results of the LSD tests revealed significant differences between engineering disciplines and basic, health, and educational sciences in five sub-dimensions of admonitory behaviors. Based on this result, it is possible to argue that faculty in engineering disciplines may hold different viewpoints than faculty members in other disciplines in terms of teaching norms.

One factor MANOVA was conducted to explore if a significant variation exists in the factor scores of faculty perceptions on admonitory norms by academic disciplines. Factor 1(not to follow lesson plan) and factor 5 (draw reaction from colleagues) scores of faculty perceptions on admonitory norms were not included in the analysis to meet the assumption of homogeneity of variances.

The MANOVA results of the scores of "disregard for teaching processes", "not sharing information with colleagues", and "disregard for students" for faculty perceptions on admonitory norms indicated significant differences in the factor scores by academic disciplines, Wilks Lambda (Λ)=0,832, $F_{(10, 241)}$=4,87, p<.01. This finding shows that the scores of the linear component derived from "disregard for learning processes", "not sharing information with colleagues", and disregard for students" would be different from the linear component scores of "not being helpful", "not using class time effectively", "disregard for teaching methods", "not to lecture in the first day of classes", and "not taking attendance" by academic disciplines.

This study had investigated faculty perceptions on undergraduate teaching practices from a normative perspective. In this sense, the study is an original work. When the inventory was adapted to Turkish culture, there found to be 50 inviolable and 64 admonitory norms related to teaching practices. In addition, there found to be differences between various institutions and three sub-dimensions of inviolable and five sub-dimensions of admonitory norms. While there found to be meaningful differences between various academic disciplines and all the sub-dimensions of inviolable norms, only one sub-dimension of admonitory norms were observed to vary by academic rank of the faculty members. Furthermore, there found to be significant differences between factors scores of admonitory norms and academic disciplines. As a result, norms, as mechanisms of social control, vary by institutions, academic rank of the faculty and academic disciplines.

The results of the study are used to provide recommendations that will aid in the identification and description of normative structure of colleges and universities. Some of these maybe: studies should

be devised to explore the effect of high number of norms on faculty-student interaction. Further Quantitative and additional qualitative studies can be conducted to explore inviolable norms in specific institutions. Admonitory norms can be explored and investigated by various disciplines.

References/Kaynakça

Anderson, M. S., & Louis, K. S. (1994). The graduate student experience and subscription to the norms of science. *Research in Higher Education, 35* (3), 273-299.

Aslantürk, Z. ve Amman, T. (2000). *Sosyloloji kavramlar-kuramlar-süreçler-teoriler*. İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.

Aydın, M. (2003). Gençliğin değer algısı: Konya örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *1* (3), 121-144.

Balcı, F. A. ve Yelken, T. Y. (2010). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin değer kavramına yükledikleri anlamlar. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 39*, 81-90.

Bilgin, N. (1995). *Sosyal psikolojide yöntem ve pratik çalışmalar.* İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Pres.

Braxton, J. M., Bayer, A. E., & Finkelstein, M. J. (1992). Teaching performance norms in academia. *Research in Higher Education*, *33* (5), 533-569.

Canatan, K. (2004). Avrupa birliğinde değerler yönelimi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 1* (3), 41-63.

Ekşi, H. (2003). Temel insani değerlerin kazandırılmasında bir yaklaşım: Karakter eğitimi programları. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *1* (1), 79-96.

Erdem, A. R. (2003). Üniversite kültüründe önemli bir unsur: Değerler. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 4*, 55-72.

Fichter, J. (1994). *Sosyoloji nedir?* (çev. N. Çelebi). Ankara: Atilla Kitabevi.

Field, A. (2009*). Discovering statistics* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Halstead, J. M. (1996). Values and values education in schools. In J. M. Halstead & M. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Values in education and education in values* (pp. 3-13). Oxon: Routledge Falmer.

İşcan, C. D. (2007). *İlköğretim düzeyinde değerler eğitimi programının etkililiği*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Karaman, S. ve Bakırcı, F. (2010). Türkiye'de lisansüstü eğitim: Sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*, 94-114.

Ling, L., & Stephenson, J. (1998). Introduction and theoretical perspectives. In J. Stephenson, L. Ling, E. Burman & M. Cooper (Eds.), *Values in education* (pp. 3-19). London: Routledge.

Merton, R. K. (1973). *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Morgan, G. A., Leech, N. L., Gloeckner, G. W., & Barrett, K. C. (2011). *IBM SPSS for Introductory statistics: Use and interpretation* (4th ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Neuman, W. L. (2010). *Toplumsal araştırma yöntemleri nitel ve nicel yaklaşımlar* (çev. S. Özge). İstanbul: Yayın Odası.

Özensel, E. (2003). Sosyolojik bir olgu olarak değer. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *1* (3), 217-239.

Rokeach, M. J. (1968). A theory of organization and change within value-attitude systems. *Journal of Social Issues*, *24*, 13-22.

Rokeach, M. J. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: The Free Press,

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 1-65.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Towards a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 550-562.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 878-891.

Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., & Vecchione, M. (2010). Basic personel values, core political values, and voting: A longitudinal analysis. *Political Psychology, 31*, 421-452.

Senemoğlu, N. (2010). *Gelişim ve öğrenme ve öğretim kuramdan uygulamaya*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Silva, A. P. D., & Stam, A. (1998). Discriminant analysis. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 277-318). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Stephenson, J., Ling, L., Burman, E., & Cooper, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Values in education*. London: Routledge.

Tarhan, N. (2012). *İnanç psikolojisi ruh, beyin ve akıl üçgeninde insanoğlu*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Varış, F. (1998). *Eğitim bilimine giriş.* Ankara: Alkım Yayıncılık.